

REMARKS:

Response to Claim Objections

As noted by the Examiner, the spelling of the word “clicking” was in need of correction, and has been corrected.

Response to 112 Rejections

The reference to the term “or the like” in claims 11 and 13 have been deleted, as required by the Examiner.

Response to Obviousness Rejections

First, Applicant contends that it would not have been obvious to combine the teaching of Sweet et al. and Beckett as in Sweet et al. the intermediate layer and the bottom layer both being arranged below the top decorative layer are fabricated of inexpensive wood in contrast to the top decorative layer being of quality hardwood.

Therefore, the skilled person would not at least partially remove the top decorative layer such that the intermediate or the bottom layer would be visible. In Beckett the first material on top of the board material may at least partially removed to provide a relief pattern with a decorative effect by applying a second material of decorative quality to the exposed board material.

Even if the teachings of Sweet et al. and Beckett would be combined they would not lead the skilled person to the claimed subject matter in an obvious way as Sweet et al. does not disclose that the support layer is a layer comprising kraft paper which is colored or dyed.

In Beckett, no support layer at all is provided. The statement of the Examiner (page 4 of the office action, 5th paragraph) that the intermediate edge portion (21) could be the support layer is not correct. In Figure 4 a sandwich of three layers is shown: 16A, 12, 10 and 16B, 12, 10. However, such a sandwich of layers is only achieved after the second material is applied to the base board with the first material on top. As the first material has no/poor adhesion relative to the second material, the skilled person would not leave the second material on top of the first material to provide a decorative panel with a relief pattern,

e.g. by partly removing the second material from the first material, as the second material would not being attached to the first material in a secure way. Such an arrangement would not be suitable for furniture and also not for floor panels as the second material may be easily removed from the first material and then the appearance of the panel would not be the same as the one of a new panel.

In Ungar, the core layer which may comprise four layers of resin impregnated paper, e.g. kraft paper, may be considered as a support layer. However, this kraft is not colored or dyed. The different layers are impregnated with different kinds of resin so as to provide layers having different tendencies to expand and contract under the influence of environmental factors.

Moreover, only Beckett discloses exposing part of a base board being covered by a first material of decorative quality. However, in Beckett the part exposed by removal of the first material is covered by the second material of decorative quality.

Even the feature that the second material may be a multilayer and color material and that a first layer may be removed from the second material to expose the second layer of different color does not seem to render obvious the claimed subject matter. The first and second materials may be a melanin or plastic laminate sheet and even when removing the first layer of the second material no support layer that is a layer comprising craft paper which is colored or dyed will form an exposed portion if the decorative layer is removed.

In Tychsen, the upper surface of a panel may be provided with a decorative upper layer (e.g. paper layer being coated with wear-resistant layer) and a soundproofing layer may be glued to the underside of the panel. However, no hints are provided that the support layer may be a layer comprising kraft paper which is colored or dyed.

//

//

//

//

Applicant is a Large Entity. Applicants believe that a one month extension of time fee (\$130.00) is required for submission of this Amendment. You are hereby authorized to deduct the required amounts from our Deposit Account No. 02-0400 (Baker & McKenzie). When identifying such a withdrawal, please use the Attorney Docket Number **BER-103**.

July 18, 2011

BAKER & McKENZIE LLP
130 E. Randolph Drive
Chicago, IL 60601
ph: +1 312 861 8608
fax: +1 312 698 2363

Respectfully,

/ David I. Roche /
David I. Roche
Reg. No. 30,797